



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/725,060 11/29/00 FURUNAGA

T 062004

EXAMINER

IM52/1026

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON DC 20037

RAIGURU II

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1711
DATE MAILED:

10/26/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) 17-19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
 - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4
- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1711

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-16, drawn to a sizing agent, classified in class 524, subclass 25.
- II. Claims 17-19, drawn to a recording paper, classified in class 162, subclass 172.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions I and II are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP... § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP... § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a coating by itself and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 1711

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

2. During a telephone conversation with Attorney Peter D. Olexy on Sept. 27, 2001 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of I, claims 1-16. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 17-19 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CAR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CAR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CAR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CAR 1.17(I).

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

withdrawn
Apr 02, 2002

Art Unit: 1711

MR Claim 16 is vague because ^{it} recites the ratio of surfactant to polysaccharide as 0.1-10. It is suggested that the ratio should be recited as "from 0.1 to 10".

Same reasoning applies to claims 13-15.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CAR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 10119425 in view of Clitherow et al. (U.S.P. 5017268).

MR (JP '425 is of record on PTO-1449, paper no 4).

Withdrawing
04-02-2002

Art Unit: 1711

JP '425 discloses a recording paper coated with a composition consisting of a fibrous substance, a filler, a cation polymer and water-soluble resin. The cationic polymer consists essentially of a quaternary ammonium salt.

JP '425 does not mention (claimed) polysaccharide as water-soluble polymer.

Clitherow discloses ^{filler}~~filler~~ compositions and their use in paper making (abstract). Such a composition comprises (a) a filler, (b) fibers and (c) a polymer as a coupling agent (col. 2, lines 30-39). Polysaccharide-based substances like starch and their derivatives have proved themselves to be particularly suitable as coupling agents (col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 9). Also suitable are poly(vinyl alcohol) and poly (vinyl acetate) (col. 6, lines 19-21). Surfactants can also be present (col. 8, line 42).

Therefore it would have been obvious to add the soybean polysaccharide of Clitherow to the coating composition of JP '425 in order to create strong bonding between sizing agent and paper to be coated. Furthermore it would have also been obvious to incorporate surfactant/s into the same composition for better dispersion and wetting.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to U.K. Rajguru whose telephone number is (703) -308-3224. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James J. Seidleck, can be reached on (703) -308-2462. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) -872-9310 or 872-9311.

Application/Control Number: 09/725,040

Page 6

Art Unit: 1711

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) -308-0661.


Rajguru/dh

October 23, 2001

James J. Goldbeck
Senior Examiner
Art Unit 1700